

On November 7, 2020, the plaintiff filed a motion to remand the action to state court. (Doc. No. 5.) But the plaintiff's motion confirms that the requirements for diversity jurisdiction exist. In his motion, the plaintiff asserts that the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000 exclusive of costs and interests and represents that he and the defendant are residents and

Case No.1:20-cv-02367

Gwin, J.

citizens of different states. (*See* Doc. No. 5-1 at 2, ¶ 6.) Although the plaintiff asserts “there is no set dollar amount” for actions filed in state court (*id.* at ¶ 6(a)), that is not a basis for remand of an action.

Accordingly, because the defendant has demonstrated the requirements for removal jurisdiction based on diversity of citizenship, the plaintiff’s motion to remand is denied.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 10, 2020

s/ James S. Gwin

JAMES S. GWIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Although 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b)(2) provides that “[a] civil action otherwise removable solely on the basis of the jurisdiction under [28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)] may not be removed if any of the parties in interest properly joined and served as defendants is a citizen of the State in which such action is brought,” the plaintiff did not assert § 1441(b)(2) as a basis for remand, and the Sixth Circuit has held that this forum-defendant exception is non-jurisdictional and waived if not raised. *See Southwell v. Summit View of Farragut, LLC*, 494 F. App’x 508, 511 n.2 (6th Cir. 2012) (“we have held that § 1441(b)(2) is non-jurisdictional and must be raised by the plaintiff in a motion to remand”); *RFF Family P’ship, LP v. Wasserman*, 316 F. App’x 410, 411 (6th Cir. 2009) (“The forum defendant provision is a procedural removal [limitation] that is waived if it is not raised by a timely motion to remand”).